

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner had rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. As suggested by the Examiner, the dependency of this claim as being corrected so that it now depends from claim 3. With respect to the other claims, the Examiner rejected many of the claims as being obvious in 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Farris in view of Inoue. The Examiner had further noted that claims 3-6, 8 and 11 were only objected to as being dependant upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if re-written in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Further, the Examiner had noted that claims 16-27 are allowed.

Accordingly, the claims are being amended without prejudice, in effect to accept the claim that the Examiner has indicated as either being allowed or allowable if suitably amended. Thus, the subject matter of claim 3 is being introduced into claim 1. It is therefore understood that the claims dependant from claim 1 will be found allowable, for introducing further patentable features and/or for being dependent from claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 are being deleted, the allowed claims 16-27 have been retained, and the method claims 28-30 are also being deleted. Accordingly, it is understood that a substantive response to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 is no longer required.

It is submitted that the application is now in order for allowance, and earlier review and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By 

H. Samuel Frost  
Reg. No. 31,696  
Tel: 416 364-7311